

# THE *Dan Smoot Report*

Vol. 4, No. 17

Monday, April 28, 1958

Dallas, Texas



DAN SMOOT

## The ADA Is Pleased

On April 7, 1958, the Senate Republican Policy Committee released a 108-page staff study which called the Americans for Democratic Action,

*a group of left-wing Democrats who hope, as either the senior or junior partner of a labor alliance, to capture the Democratic party and bring about a system which would amount to national socialism in America.*

Claiming that the ADA's,

*perennial statist program presents a distinct parallel to that of the communists,*

the Senate Republican Policy Committee staff study said that Americans for Democratic Action was formed (in January, 1947),

*because so many who called themselves 'liberals' in the heyday of the new deal had, wittingly or unwittingly, found themselves in the same corner with the communists and fellow travelling coterie in advancing their pet policies, a sort of purification rite became necessary.*

Here are some of the prominent "liberals" who helped organize ADA.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt;

Walter Reuther, James Carey, and Louis Hollander — CIO leaders;

Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and Marquis Childs — newspaper columnists;

Wilson Wyatt and Joseph Rauh — former Administrators of the National Housing Agency;

Paul Porter and Leon Henderson — former Administrators of OPA;

Francis Biddle — former Attorney General;

Mrs. Dorothy Schiff — publisher of the *New York Post*;

Hubert Humphrey — Mayor of Minneapolis, later United States Senator;

Paul Douglas — University of Chicago Professor, later United States Senator;

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine edited and published weekly by Dan Smoot, mailing address P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas, Telephone TAYlor 4-8683 (Office Address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$3.00 for 3 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.00 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.00 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00—each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Frank Graham — President of the University of North Carolina, later United States Senator;

Herbert Lehman — ex-governor of New York, later U. S. Senator.

No one could effectively deny the truth or accuracy of the Senate Republican Policy Committee's statements about the ADA and its leaders.

But the Senate Republican group could have given ADA credit for substantial influence in running the Republican Party, too.

On April 2, 1958, Robert R. Nathan, National Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, supporting President Eisenhower's requests for foreign aid appropriations.

Mr. Nathan boasted that the Eisenhower administration has been following the main outlines of ADA's program — but complained that the Administration has not been as open-handed as ADA recommended.

Mr. Nathan said:

*Mr. Chairman, when I testified last year, I took occasion to welcome three forward steps in the Administration's proposals — steps which we of ADA had long advocated.*

1. *The recognition, in the proposal of the Development Loan Fund, that economic development is a continuing and long-term process, and that the United States must be in a position to make commitments beyond a year-to-year basis.*

2. *The availability, through this Fund, of loans which may be repaid in local currencies.*

3. *The separation, then proposed by the Administration, of the funds appropriated for technical and economic assistance from those for military aid, including defense support.*

*We are pleased that the establishment of*

*the Development Loan Fund was approved by Congress. However, we must warn that the allocation in this year's proposals of only \$625 million for this Fund, plus the miniscule provision for grant aid, will not suffice. To embark upon long-term development programs with the necessary confidence, the less advanced countries must be able to count on a decent minimum of assistance from the United States for at least a decade . . .*

*We are sorry that the Administration has not renewed its proposal, rejected by Congress last year, that economic and technical assistance be separated from military aid.*

Mr. Nathan compliments the Eisenhower Administration for following ADA recommendations with regard to the UN technical assistance program:

*Mr. Chairman, last year we made what we considered constructive suggestions for the improvement of our overseas aid program. In particular, we urged that a steadily growing portion of it be channeled through the United Nations. We are therefore pleased that the United States Delegation to the United Nations has proposed an enlargement of the UN technical assistance program from its present level of about \$30 million to about \$100 million, including the Special Project Fund.*

The UN technical assistance program, which Mr. Nathan talks about, was first authorized by the UN General Assembly on November 16, 1949. It went into operation on July 1, 1950.

The United States, in addition to its own direct foreign aid programs, has been providing approximately 60% of all the foreign aid given as UN Technical Assistance.

The UN Technical Assistance Program was set up as a potential means of putting the savings and investments and income of Americans at the disposal of international socialists,

so that they could scatter the wealth of America around over the earth to achieve a major communist goal:

**socialize the American economy and pull down the American standard of living by using American money to pay for socialization of foreign economies and the raising of foreign living standards — until the economies and living standards of all nations would be about the same.**

This leveling of the living standards and economies of all nations on earth has been the announced long-range objective of communists since the early 1920's — Stalin and other Kremlin leaders believing that communist world-wide dictatorship could not be established until the economic leveling was first achieved.

It is true, and obvious, that America's direct foreign aid programs have been achieving this major communist objective. Hence, at first glance, it may seem odd that the international socialists ever felt the need to set up the UN Technical Assistance Program at all.

There were good reasons.

(1) Even as early as November, 1949, when the UN Technical Assistance Program was created, the American public was becoming increasingly sick and suspicious of our foreign aid programs. Every year, the administration had to fight for foreign aid appropriations — and the opposition of "reactionaries" and "isolationists" was growing. If our foreign aid could be channeled through a UN agency, the Administration wouldn't need to make a specific budget request for foreign aid. The President each year could just send Congress a statement, so to speak, saying this is what you owe for our participation in UN Technical Assistance.

Then, if Congress resisted, it could be beaten over the head with propaganda about

not meeting our "moral obligations" in the "world peace agency," and about "trying to destroy UN, the key to peace and the keystone of our foreign policy."

Thus, the issue could be camouflaged from American public view and understanding. The debate each year would not be on the question of whether American wages and income should be confiscated for the benefit of socialist and communist governments abroad — but on the false question of whether "America should meet her moral obligations in the United Nations."

(2) Channeling American foreign aid through a UN agency would remove any *possibility* that America might derive some *national* benefit from giving foreign aid. Communists were pleased that our foreign aid was achieving their long-range objectives; and they didn't want us to stop; but there was some possibility that our direct aid might be winning a few foreign friends for us. If the communists could get our aid channeled through the UN, where it would lose all identity as coming from America, they could have the program they want without any risk that it might help America.

(3) Even if the UN Technical Assistance Program failed to take over America's direct foreign aid effort, the mere existence of the UN program would create diversionary political quarrels helpful in keeping American foreign aid going.

Americans who had been luke-warm, or even hostile, about American foreign aid would rather give direct aid than turn our money over to a UN agency. Some of these would thus be maneuvered into *supporting* American foreign aid, considering it at least better than aid through the UN — supporting it, in other words, as the lesser of two evils.



We actually saw this happen in 1956. Adlai Stevenson openly advocated channeling more and more of our aid through the UN. Eisenhower tiptoed around this issue, leaving the impression that Republicans favored foreign aid as a *national*, American program. This caused many misinformed conservatives to think that Stevenson was left of, and therefore worse than, Eisenhower. Many American conservatives who are opposed to foreign aid nonetheless supported foreign aid by voting for Eisenhower, because they imagined him the lesser of two evils — imagined that his brand of foreign aid wasn't quite as bad as Stevenson's.

As soon as Mr. Eisenhower was reelected, his delegation to the UN — as revealed by the testimony of Robert Nathan, National Chairman of ADA — supported the Stevenson idea of channeling more of our aid through the UN.

For a discussion of the Development Loan Fund (which Mr. Nathan claims was an ADA idea, which was proposed by the Republican Administration last year, and which was approved by the Democratic Congress) see *The Dan Smoot Report*, January 27, 1958.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Lapse of Memory?

Robert R. Nathan, National Chairman of Americans For Democratic Action, testifying in support of foreign aid on April 2, 1958, summed up his testimony by saying that we should "quit wasting our time and energy on the yapping of unreconstructed isolationists" — "unreconstructed isolationists" being, of course, all American taxpayers who object to having their money confiscated and sent overseas to finance international socialism.

Mr. Nathan says we should plunge headlong into foreign aid programs bigger than any ever

before dreamed of, and put them on a permanent basis.

He said:

*I believe the time has come to weave an over-all pattern for overseas aid — a grand design bold enough to capture the imagination of the American people — and of the world.*

Mr. Nathan interlards his testimony with compliments to the Eisenhower administration for adopting ADA proposals, but jibes at it for not going all out.

Nathan also repeats the standard argument of all foreign aiders: namely, that if we will work hard and give away the product of our labor, the activity of working and giving away will make us rich. The way to cure the current recession in America is to take more away from Americans — who are suffering because so much has already been taken away from them — and give more to foreign governments. Imposing on Americans the necessity of supporting the rest of the world will make Americans work harder — and that will be good for Americans, because the more they work the more they stimulate their own economy.

As I have indicated, *all* foreign aiders — modern republicans as well as new dealers — use this extraordinary argument about getting rich by giving away our riches.

It isn't logical to expect any logic of such people — but wouldn't you think it would sometime occur to them that, if the activity of working hard and giving away the product of our labor will make us rich, the same activity might make other nations rich? And if we keep giving to them so that they won't have to work as hard as we do, won't we retard their progress?

The most interesting portions of Robert A. Nathan's testimony in support of foreign aid are his comments relating our foreign aid program to the struggle against communism.

Mr. Nathan said:

*Mr. Chairman, last year I testified just after Mr. Krushchev, in a televised interview seen by millions of Americans, declared with complete confidence — indeed, with arrogance — that he looked forward to the world-wide triumph of communism in this century. His final assumption of the mantle of Stalin last week makes it all too clear that he has full power to devote the great resources of the Soviet Union to reaching this goal . . . . Moreover, he intends to speed this process up by his own aid and trade program — an idea he picked up rather belatedly from our own program.*

If there is any person on earth who ought to be thoroughly familiar with the tactics and objectives of the world-wide communist conspiracy, that person is the national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

So, we must assume that Mr. Nathan has had a lapse of memory. He has forgotten that the communists did not *borrow* the foreign aid idea from us. They *gave* it to us. Foreign aid is a communist program designed to level the economies of nations as a necessary step toward establishing a communist one-world.

The communists make gestures of offering aid, and challenge us to meet them in such "economic competition" as a means of gulling us into giving more aid — thus speeding the already galloping process of communizing the world.

The facts — which Mr. Nathan must have forgotten — prove these assertions.

## The Facts

Joseph Stalin, in an article published in *Pravda*, May 8, 1921, (reprinted pp. 111-117, *Joseph Stalin: Marxism and the National Question, Selected Writings and Speeches*, published in 1942 by International Publishers, New York) said:

*. . . a new element has been introduced into the national question — the element of real (and not merely juridical) equalization of nations (helping and encouraging the backward nations to raise themselves to the cultural and economic level of the more advanced nations), as one of the conditions necessary for securing fraternal co-operation between the toiling masses of the various nationalities.*

*In the period of the Second International they usually confined themselves to proclaiming 'national equality'; at best they did not go beyond demanding the realization of such equality. But national equality, in itself a very important political acquisition, runs the risk of remaining merely an empty phrase if adequate resources and opportunities for exercising this very important right do not exist . . . .*

*That is why it is essential that the triumphant proletariat of the advanced countries should render aid, real and prolonged aid, to the toiling masses of the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development; that it should help them to rise to a higher stage of development and to catch up with the more advanced nationalities.*

*Unless such aid is forthcoming it will be impossible to bring about the peaceful co-existence and fraternal collaboration of the toilers of the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that are so essential for the final triumph of socialism.*

In April, 1944, International Publishers (official publishing company of the Commu-

nist Party, USA) published *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, by Earl Browder, then General Secretary of the Communist Party.

This was Browder's report on the meeting which Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill had had at Teheran in 1943 — revealing, incidentally, that Browder knew more about what went on at Teheran than the American capitalist press knew, at the time.

Browder was aglow with optimism about the brave new world which would grow out of the Roosevelt-Stalin-Churchill Teheran agreements. One of the things he anticipated was our post-war foreign aid programs.

On pages 79-80 of *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*, Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, said:

*Our government can create a series of giant industrial development corporations, each in partnership with some other government or group of governments, and set them to work upon large-scale plans of railroad and highway building, agricultural and industrial development, and all-around modernization in all the devastated and undeveloped areas of the world. America has the skilled technicians capable of producing the plans for such projects, sufficient to get them under way, within a six-month period of time after the decision is made.*

*There is not a government in the capitalist or colonial world that would dare refuse or withdraw itself from such a partnership, once the United States made clear the benefits that would accrue to all concerned.*

*The scale of financing would have to be not greater than already adopted for the war, and instead of resulting in destruction of life and wealth, it would immediately bring about a great improvement of life and start great streams of new wealth flowing throughout the world that would soon far exceed the initial*

*investments. On a world scale the combined projects could be self-liquidating in the period of a generation. They would become the best investments the American capitalist class had ever made in its whole history.*

*Over and above the profits in money, which would be the immediate incentive for American capitalists, such a program would provide the inestimable profit of securing the generations of peace and well-being in the world promised at Teheran.*

\* \* \* \* \*

## Speeks, Grannyflaxes and Rallopahs

A taxpayer wrote Senator Arthur V. Watkins (Republican, Utah), calling his attention to a sentence in the Internal Revenue Service's latest instructions on how to file an income tax.

The taxpayer said he couldn't understand it.

The sentence, 212 words long, is captioned "Additional Charge for Underpayment of Estimated Tax." It is on page 8 of the Internal Revenue Service Booklet, *How To Prepare Your Income Tax Return on Form 1040*.

The sentence reads:

*The charge with respect to any underpayment of any installment is mandatory and will be made unless the total amount of all payments of estimated tax made on or before the last date prescribed for the payment of such installment equals or exceeds whichever of the following is the lesser —*

*(A) The amount which would have been required to be paid on or before such date if the estimated tax were whichever of the following is the least —*

*(1) The tax shown on your return for*



the previous year (if your return for such year showed a liability for tax and covered a taxable year of 12 months), or

(2) A tax computed by using the previous year's income with the current year's rates and exemptions, or

(3) 70 per cent (66 2/3 per cent in the case of farmers) of a tax computed by projecting to the end of the year the income received from the beginning of the year up to the beginning of the month of the installment payment; or

(B) An amount equal to 90 per cent of the tax computed, at the rates applicable to the taxable years, on the basis of the actual taxable income for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid.

Senator Watkins studied the sentence for a long time, but he couldn't understand it either. He showed it to several other Senators. None of them could figure out what it means.

The Senator took the problem up with the Internal Revenue Service.

A spokesman for that service said that the 212 word sentence represents the best efforts

of experts to be clear and brief. He said that Internal Revenue experts had "done their best to make this instruction readable and understandable," that they had used "the clearest language possible."

In despair, Senator Watkins organized a contest and offered a prize to the person giving the best explanation of what the 212-word sentence means.

The prize: a copy of the *Bible* and a copy of the book, *Simplified English*.

The contest closed April 14, 1958; but Senator Watkins has not yet announced a winner.

I, as is customary with me, have a constructive suggestion: all taxpayers and United States Senators who cannot understand the Internal Revenue Service's simplified instructions should take a course in Speeks and Grannyflaxes.

The following article, written by Harry J. Crompe and published in the December 19, 1957, issue of *Citizen Newspaper*, 125 North La Brea Avenue, Inglewood, California, represents all I know about Speeks and Grannyflaxes; but that is, perhaps, enough:

*It's been a lot more years than I care to re-*

## WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of American Civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He served as an FBI Agent in all parts of the nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for three and a half years, he worked exclusively on communist investigations in the industrial midwest. For two years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an Administrative Assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After nine and a half years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost four years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side — the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues. Smoot now has no support from, or connections with, any other person or organization. His program is financed entirely from sales of his weekly publication, *The Dan Smoot Report*.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to *The Dan Smoot Report*.

*member when I was a freshman in high school but I pity the class in this day and age.*

*A pert mother brought to my desk this week an English textbook being used in the Centinela Valley Union High School District that sent me jibbering to the washroom.*

*I have many memories of the difficulty I had in conjugating verbs and sentence structure but I'm willing to wager none of these difficulties are as bad as the ones these poor freshmen are suffering in the CVUHSD.*

*I copied verbatim from one of the exercises in the book entitled "Patterns of English" by Paul Roberts, a professor of English at San Jose Teachers College.*

*Here it is:*

Exercise 31: Here is a little drama about a speak and a grannyflax. First read the passage aloud. Then copy it out, writing the form-class and structure group symbols above the words. Use the symbols above the words. Use symbol C for the words and and but. (The first sentence is done to start you out.) Then write down all you have learned about speaks and grannyflaxes...

*Following this introduction to the Exercise, there appeared some secret formula...*  
**D 1 D 1 2 P D 1!**

*The exercise continues:*

One day a speak orgled into a floom. In the center of the floom was a very grutious grannyflax. As everyone knows, speaks geeble grannyflaxes, though grannyflaxes never foobar speaks. This grannyflax was nifty and rather kloobful. It had an ignormous spale on its timtam. The speak was quite crebulous. It spanged the spale of the grannyflax and flebbed it stilefully. But the grannyflax still had a boosh. While the speak was flebbing its spale, it baffed the speak on the boobin and rabbled away.

*I shook my head a couple of times too after reading this, but then Paragraph B of the instructions really threw me. It read:*

Rewrite the paragraph, keeping all the real words as they are but putting in new nonsense words.

**REWRITE? PUT IN NEW NONSENSE WORDS?**

*How could you possibly rewrite that gem and where would you ever find any more nonsense words?*

*Then Paragraph C said:*

Make up a new story, about a queel and a dillymump, to read to the class.

*I'll bet the class goes into hysterics!*

*In the front of this textbook there is some sort of an explanation but even I couldn't make sense of that:*

Proof of this is that we can have nonsense words in formclass positions in a sentence and still get the general drift of the sentence... Consider this: When the slooppy wamtupper had eviptally loofed the strambix, the rallopah scomed up his flibbles and skorked.

*That doggoned rallopah did it again!*

*This textbook had some other ideas on how to make Johnny read English but one of the classic instructions I came across was as follows:*

Make a list of words or phrases which boys use regularly but which girls seldom or never use. (Keep it decent.)

*I'll bet that list had the class in stitches!*

*The mother who brought this book to me was understandably concerned. I, as an editor, am too. I'd hate to hire a reporter who spoke that language.*

*And we thought the three R type of education was tough.*

\* \* \* \* \*

## Reutherism

This interesting brief was taken from "Washington Report," weekly newsletter of Congressman Bruce Alger (Republican, Texas):

"Walter Reuther calling Senator Barry Goldwater a "moral coward," provoked Congressman Clare Hoffman to compare the war record of the two:

"(1) Goldwater, a pilot in service;

"(3) Reuther, classified 3A because of marriage, at home leading strikes which killed 41 people (1937-46)."

Please note that our new mailing address is P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas. See bottom of page 1 for subscription rates and reprint orders.



mp,

me  
n't

s in  
eral  
opy  
pah

ow  
the  
ol-

gu-  
de-

me  
or,  
oke

ca-

om  
of  
in,

ry  
on-  
var

of  
ed

[ ]